

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-24 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-24 are finally rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23 are amended by Applicant.

Amendment After Final

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested on the ground that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested on the ground that this amendment places the claims in better form and condition for appeal. Applicant submits that the amendments presented herein do not contain new matter and are clarifying by virtue of explanation contained in the present specification.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 1, 5, 10 15, 17, 22 and 23 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786 to Densmore et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,152 to Wong et al.

Concerning Claim 1 and 10, Examiner states that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate a level of indirection from application programming interfaces used by a class locator. Concerning Claim 5 and 23, Examiner states that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate forwarding the search request to search the appropriate class path for the search request. Concerning Claim 15, Examiner states that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate to invoke element specific search methods. Concerning Claim 17, Examiner states that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate to map class searches to each element for independent handling. Concerning Claim 22, Examiner states that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate a transparent level of indirection to services. Applicant agrees with Examiner on these points.

Examiner goes on to state that Wong et al. at col. 5, lines 8-27 and col. 7, lines 14-56 discloses the limitations in Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23 which are not found in Densmore et al. In light of the claims as amended, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The present Application provides a description of the use of a level of indirection and the use of different caches for selected elements on pages 3 lines 25-33 and page 4 lines 1 and 2 as follows:

The class path manager creates a wrapper for each element in the class path as identified by a class path environment variable. The wrapper is used to provide a level of indirection when calls are made to determine the location of a class. If the element is not one which is viable to cache, standard system services are invoked to perform a search of the path of that element. If the element is one for which caching is viable, a caching wrapper is created which invokes methods to search the cache for that element. The indirection provided by the wrappers allows multiple different types of caches to be provided for elements without increasing the complexity of the class path manager, nor changing the normal calls from applications that need to find the class.

Amended Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23 contain the clarifying limitation that a search includes a wrapper that is generated for selected elements in a class path and that the wrapper provides a level of indirection which provides that different caches are used for the selected elements. Claim 1 is exemplary of the amendments of the current response which is recited in relevant part:

1. A method of locating classes in a class path, the method comprising:
 - generating a cache of information relating to the classes in the class path;
 - creating a wrapper for selected elements in the class path to provide a level of indirection from application programming interfaces used by a class locator, the wrapper indirection level providing for different caches to be used for the selected elements;

Neither Densmore et al. nor Wong et al. teach or suggest a wrapper that provides a level of indirection such that the wrapper indirection level provides for different caches to be used for different elements as does amended Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Densmore et al. nor Wong et al. either individually or in combination can render amended Claim 1 obvious. The same conclusion may be drawn for amended Claims 5, 10,

DOCKET NO.: 129989.1 / MSFT-0517
Application No.: 09/266,675
Office Action Dated: 10/8/2003

PATENT

15, 17, 22 and 23 as those claims are similarly amended with the clarifying amendments concerning the use of a level of indirection and the use of different caches for different elements.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C §103(a) rejections for the above stated reasons and submits that amended Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23 are in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant submits that Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16, 19-21 and 24 are allowable as depending from now-allowable Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application in light of the amendments and remarks presented above. Applicant submits that the amendments presented herein do not contain new matter and are clarifying by virtue of explanation contained in the present specification. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Date: February 2, 2004



Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50, 800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439